

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 15 have been amended. Claims 1 – 9 and 15 - 17 are pending in this Application. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

Claims 1 – 5 , 9, and 15 – 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Chang et al. (Patent No. US 6,556,724). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Applicants' exemplary claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the invention sets forth a method for configuring and dynamically adapting an application sharing system. The method comprises the step of determining a preference for a shared application, and monitoring by the one of the computers a feedback generated by the one of the system components and derived from the output of the shared application, the feedback indicating the performance of the component relative to the determined preference. Thus the Applicants clarify that the claimed computer is monitoring feedback generated by the system component and derived from the shared application.

Chang, in contrast, describes a classic client server application. Chang presents an image collaboration system wherein a host computer provides a source resolution independent image to client computers. (Chang Fig. 5, 320, Col. 9, lines 45 – 47.) Specifically in the case of Chang, each client computer sends calculated coefficient coordinates needed to render an image based on its client specific resolution. (Chang Fig. 5, 340, Col. 9 lines 50 - 54). In support of the Applicants' claimed step of "monitoring", the Office Action at page 3 refers to Chang: fig. 5, col. 9, lines 50 – 60, noted that the image server 200 transmits the requested transform data at the

designated coefficient coordinated to the participating client”. The Applicants respectfully assert that transmitting requested data to a client is not monitoring by the client. Further, Office Action of at page 6, in “Response to Arguments”, points out that “Chang specifically discloses that the host computer receives the resolution at which each participating client will render images for the collaboration session and determines the highest resolution for the clients. The adjustment for the resolution of the image that is rendered to the participating clients is made at the host server.” Thus - the “clients” of Chang are not monitoring the shared application of Chang. The clients of Chang merely send to the host their required settings.

Thus, Chang fails to teach or suggest the Applicants’ claimed method for configuring and dynamically adapting an application sharing system, including the step of “monitoring by the one of the computers a feedback generated by the one of the system components and derived from the output of the shared application, said feedback indicating the performance of the component relative to the determined preference.

The Applicants therefore assert that Claims 1 – 5, 9, and 15 – 16 are not anticipated by Chang and are allowable.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 6 - 8 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang in view of Boston et al. (PGPUB: US 2004/0101272). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 6 – 8 depend on Claim 1. Claim 17 depends on Claim 15. Boston adds nothing further to solve the deficiencies of Chang as discussed above. Thus Chang and Boston, taken

together or in part, fail to teach or suggest the Applicants' claimed invention as set forth in claims 1 – 9 and 15 – 17. The Applicants therefore respectfully assert that claims 1 – 9 and 15 – 17 are in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and arguments made herein, Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance and request early favorable action by the Examiner.

If the Examiner believes that a telephone conversation with the Applicants' representative would expedite allowance of this application, the Examiner is cordially invited to call the undersigned at (508) 303-2003, or at the undersigned's cell, (617) 901-6786.

Date: May 18, 2010
Reg. No.: 37,946

Fax No.: (508) 303-0005
Tel. No.: (508) 303-2003

Respectfully submitted,
/Mary M. Steubing/
Mary M. Steubing
Attorney for Applicants
Guerin & Rodriguez, LLP
5 Mount Royal Avenue
Marlborough, MA 01752